

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended and claim 11 is added. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least at paragraph [0013] and Figs. 2 and 3. Support for amendment to claim 10 can be found at least at paragraph [0055] and Figs. 6(a)-(c). No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Duong in the May 24, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. Claims 1 and 2

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,074 to Bos et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,898 to Numano et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,160,535 to Park. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 2 would not have been rendered obvious by Bos in view of Numano and Park. None of the applied references teach or suggest "a first light shielding film disposed between the first substrate and the switching element at a region corresponding to the switching element but not at a region corresponding to between adjacent pixel areas," and "a second light shielding film disposed between the switching element and the liquid crystal at the region corresponding to the switching element but not at the region corresponding to between adjacent pixel areas," as recited in amended claim 1. That is, none of the applied references teach or suggest providing light shielding at the switching element, but not in between adjacent pixel elements.

Thus, claim 1 and claim 2 depending therefrom would not have been rendered obvious by Bos in view of Numano and Park. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 4, 5 and 8

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,459 to Ichikawa et al.

Claims 4, 5 and 8 depend from claim 1. Ichikawa would not remedy the deficiencies discussed with regard to claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, claims 4, 5 and 8 would not have been rendered obvious by Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of Ichikawa. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Claim 6

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,092,664 to Miyatake et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Miyatake would not remedy the deficiencies discussed with regard to claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, claim 6 would not have been rendered obvious by Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of Miyatake. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

D. Claim 7

The Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,218,679 to Takahara et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Takahara would not remedy the deficiencies discussed with regard to claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to

claim 1, claim 7 would not have been rendered obvious by Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of Takahara. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

E. Claim 9

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,040,890 to Sawada et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Sawada would not remedy the deficiencies discussed with regard to claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1, claim 9 would not have been rendered obvious by Bos in view of Numano and Park. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

F. Claim 10

The Office Action rejects claim 10 over Sawada in view of Park. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 would not have been rendered obvious by Sawada in view of Park. None of the applied references teach or suggest "adjacent pixel electrodes being separate from each other by a space L of approximately 1 μm ," as recited in amended independent claim 10.

That is, as discussed in the specification for the above-identified application, in conventional highly defined liquid crystals having a structure in which spaces between the pixel electrodes are decreased to approximately $1 \times 10^{-6}\text{m}$, the frame inversion driving method, as shown in Fig. 6(a), is the only method to be employed due to the influence of the lateral electrical field. In contrast, with the configuration of the present invention, even when a driving method is employed in which voltages have different pluralities are applied to the pixels adjacent to each other, as shown in Figs. 6(b)-6(c), the generation of disclination lines in display area is decreased. See, e.g., paragraph [0054] and Figs. 6(a)-6(c). Nowhere does Sawada or Park teach or suggest this feature.

Thus, claim 10 would not have been rendered obvious by Sawada in view of Park.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/cfr

Date: June 8, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--